

THE
ANTI-SLAVERY RECORD.

VOL. III. No. V.

MAY, 1837.

WHOLE No. 29.

[From the Friend of Man.]

NO PRINCIPLE AT STRIFE WITH PRINCIPLE;

OR, CIPHERS IN BATTLE ARRAY WITH WHOLE NUMBERS.

THE controversy which the claims of the American slave have produced among professed Christians at the North, we are well persuaded, must every day grow more earnest and determined. On the one hand those who give their sympathies to the oppressor, seem bent at all events to support his arrogant pretensions, and on shielding him from the infamy and execration which he has so long been courting, and which he is likely soon to win. On the other, the friends of the enslaved would as soon in any other way rush upon destruction, as in abandoning their suppliant brother to the "tender mercies" of his tormentors.

The assumption which is made, that this is a controversy among "*good men*," seems to hinder many from examining the ground on which it is maintained. The matter at issue, they imagine, cannot in any of its bearings be vital to the cause of truth and righteousness. It must, they suppose, be one of those questions, which from some unhappy accident, and not from their own intrinsic importance, have often agitated and rent the Christian Church—strangely arraying against each other, *brethren* of the same temper, spirit, and pursuits. They wonder why one disciple of Jesus Christ should quarrel with another about a trifle—a vexed question of doubtful import. That the question must be of doubtful import they infer from the character which they ascribe to the controvertists—the character of "*good men*." Such, they are sure, can never be involved in gross delusion and fatal error. Why, then, they are ready to inquire, cannot these "*good men*" just turn their thoughts away from these exciting topics, on which they cannot come to an agreement; and forgetting the wrongs of the oppressed, seek and find the luxury of mutual love in the embraces of fraternal concord?

Such speculatists, moreover, are apt to think that a question which so distracts the Church—which sets "*good men*" at variance with each

other, must be of a very delicate complexion, remarkable for its subtle bearings, and of difficult decision. They hesitate to enter into a controversy which, they think, must require more acuteness of perception, more comprehensiveness of views, more maturity of judgment, than they can ever command. They are afraid to involve themselves in a labyrinth. What if they should be unable, amidst its mazes, to thread their way to clear light and sound ground! And as they presume that either side and no side is *equally safe*, they keep themselves as stupidly indifferent as they can!

But to him who is thus "at ease in Zion," we must say, that with his eyes on those whom the claims of the slave have aroused to earnest controversy, he makes a *bold and unwarrantable assumption*, when he ascribes to them, irrespective of the ground they occupy, goodness of character. He is not entitled to the premises from which his self-indulgent conclusions proceed. A careful examination of the subject might force upon him the unwelcome apprehension, that the character of a multitude of his good men must be far more doubtful than the decision of the question from which he stands aloof. What makes him think that such can be good men as refuse to give the enslaved their sympathy and aid? Is he sure that they are better than was Saul of Tarsus before his heart was reached by the Saviour's power? Are they of respectable connexions and cultivated minds, occupying an elevated place in the religious world? That was *his* condition. Are they orthodox, enterprising, zealous? So was he. Are they remarkable for their religious activity—for their fervent attachment to the sect they support—for their expensive exertions to sustain divine institutions—for their missionary spirit? So was he. Not one among them all is a whit superior to him in any of these particulars. Nor is the complexion of their morality at all fairer than that of which he boasted. And must we not extend the parallel? Was he clannish in his attachments—fast bound in every limb by the cord of caste? So are they. Did he offer his sympathy and his services to a set of heartless tyrants, who in church and state were intent on crushing the poor beneath their iron hoofs? So do they. Was he driven, by a fierce and hot attachment to a sect, into warfare with human nature? So are they. Was he ready to sacrifice the rights of the poor on the altar of priestly arrogance and political domination? So are they. Was he busy in persecuting those philanthropists who gave themselves up to honest, generous, self-sacrificing exertions to purify, and elevate, and bless the human family, irrespective of constitutional peculiarities or

factitious distinctions? So are they busy in the self-same employment—as eager, active, violent, as the powers they wield and their own views of expediency (the idol which they worship) will permit them to be. In what respect are their claims to goodness superior to his?

What is the ground of controversy between abolitionists and their opponents? What is the object of this earnest strife? We answer, *Fundamental principles in morality and religion are the sacred, the invaluable stake.* We have here a controversy between adherence to principle on the one hand, and a reckless disregard of principle on the other. The very vitals of Humanity are concerned in this strife. If the yoke of the enslaved is broken, Humanity will escape from the incubus by which she has been wellnigh suffocated—she will breathe freely again. If the pledged auxiliaries of the oppressor triumph, Humanity must bleed at every pore, and can escape from her insatiate foes only by some special intervention of Almighty Power.

Nothing can be more clearly revealed in the light of reason, than the principles which the abolitionists find laid at the basis of the enterprise to which the voice of God calls them to devote their powers.

1. *They feel impelled to regard every thing AS IT IS—to treat every thing ACCORDING TO ITS NATURE.* Are they not as obviously bound, as resistlessly constrained, so to do, as to admit that the whole is greater than a part? To deny and reject such a principle, is to wage war upon their own nature—to stifle the voice of the Creator! Truth, under its simplest form—truth, by its highest authority—requires of them, in all things and everywhere, strongly to assert and strenuously to act upon this principle.

2. *To describe a man AS A THING, and to dispose of him AS “AN ARTICLE OF MERCHANDISE,” must be a crime of the most malignant tendency.* Such an act involves monstrous falsehood. The “truth of God it changes into a lie.” Grosser and more glaring falsehood cannot be conceived of, than is condensed and embodied in the chattel principle. In the solemn forms of law, to style a MAN “an article of merchandise!” This he is not, cannot be. The very fundamental principle of American slavery, without which it would vanish like a ghost at daybreak, is itself, in its very nature, obviously and certainly a falsehood.

This principle is pregnant, moreover, with the most malignant tendencies. Admitted to the mind, it pollutes the soul with bloody thoughts. Reduced to practice, it is murder. We once heard of a wretch, who, meeting his enemy, lifted his poniard, and bade him

renounce Christ or die. Driven to desperation, his victim renounced the Saviour. Now, exclaimed the murderer, as he buried his steel in his neighbor's bosom, now I am well revenged. I have killed you, *soul and body!* This is the fell purpose, this the horrid tendency of the chattel principle! It forces its innocent, helpless, shrieking victim on to the very barrier, sacred as the throne of Heaven, which separates Humanity from the herd of beasts and the heap of things below, and remorselessly hurls him from the lofty battlements to be torn and broken by the ragged rocks which await his fall! Is it not murder to reduce a man to an article of merchandise? *Humanity is annihilated.* Spirit, soul, and body, are, by the transforming power of the chattel principle, wrought into a beast of burden or an implement of husbandry. THE MAN has vanished! Not a relic left! You have a *thing instead*, which, with your pigs and poultry, you may sell to the highest bidder! Where now is Abel our brother? Alas, a victim he has fallen to the chattel principle!

It is no alleviation of the crime of slavery, that it cannot effect its full designs. Were its power equal to its malignity, it would dissolve the universe. It would drag the Eternal from his throne, and drive him to the same auction where His children are exposed to sale. But the genius of slavery,—that lying spirit, which possesses so large a portion, priest and people, of our misguided and unhappy countrymen—we solemnly charge with the monstrous crime of wagging day and night the tongue of falsehood; and wielding, without weariness or intermission, the scythe of death.

3. *We maintain that it is equally obvious and certain, that continuance in sin cannot but aggravate our guilt and increase our danger.* If sin is to be regarded "as an evil and bitter thing," how can this doctrine be disputed? A single act in violation of the law of rectitude involves guilt and demands punishment. As sin is persisted in, such acts are multiplied. Their malignant tendencies and ill deserts are continually and at a frightful rate increased. Just apply this general doctrine to the enslaver. While he maintains to any human creature, the monstrous relation of an owner to a thing, every hour which is added to his life is an hour spent in adding crime to crime—in "filling up the measure" of his iniquity! To such an one, the doctrines of "gradualism" are the voice of the serpent. They encourage him to hold on for the present in rebellion against Heaven. They permit, nay, require him yet a little longer, to busy himself in "treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath!" He is, according to them, to prepare himself for

future duty by violating *present* obligations! Such doctrines, our regard for the oppressor as well as for the oppressed, leads us promptly and with deep abhorrence to reject. In popish indulgences, in their worst forms, we see nothing at all more revolting and mischievous.

4. *Under the government of God, REPENTANCE, IMMEDIATE AND THOROUGH, cannot but be right; in its consequences it must be safe and happy.* In rectitude, the throne of God finds its firm foundations. By this, the pillars of the universe are sustained. This is the principle of eternal harmony throughout the whole creation. By conforming to this, every creature, whoever and whatever he may be, finds his natural place and appropriate employment. Here, and only here, can he healthfully inspire the all-enlivening breath of Jehovah—can he be animated with that “*life*” with which God quickens his obedient subjects.

The relation of repentance to rectitude is direct and intimate. The sinner studies the law which he has dared to violate. His transgressions flash upon his face. He is aroused, alarmed, distressed. To simple rectitude, as the standard, to which his responsibilities refer him, he lifts his eye. With an honest reference to that standard, he begins immediately to act. He “breaks off his sins by righteousness and his iniquities by turning to the Lord.”—Such is the relation of repentance to rectitude.

What, then, can *they* mean, who venture to affirm, that under the government of God, the path of safety is not always coincident with the line of rectitude? Who allege, that in invading human rights, we may be reduced to such a plight as to be constrained by invincible necessity still longer to invade them? What is this, but, in the language of the apostate Hebrews, “*to be delivered to do such abominations?*” In what light, must *he* regard the government of God, who can admit the thought, that in his providence his subjects may be reduced to the necessity of “CONTINUING IN SIN!” If such be the government of God, how can any saint on earth or seraph in the skies, shout “halleluia! the Lord God omnipotent reigneth?”

We do not forget, that on the line of rectitude the dungeon sometimes is built and the stake erected. There murderers, with their bloodhounds in the form of mobs sometimes take their stand, to oppose the progress of the righteous. So it was when the army of martyrs maintained, at the expense of their lives, the battles of their Lord. They welcomed the flames of persecution with the inspiring appeal upon their lips; “*whether it be right in the sight of God to obey you, rather than God, judge ye.*” But was not their course as safe and happy

in its results, as it was coincident with rectitude? Was it not well for them—well for the human family, that they “resisted even unto blood” those who would have driven them aside from their shining track?

Environ the slaveholder with whatever difficulties his most ingenious apologist can invent; still, he is bound by the most sacred obligations to restore without delay to his injured brother his violated rights. Better die a thousand deaths than lend his countenance for a single hour to the system of American oppression. *Sin* is the most deadly foe to human peace. Unarmed by this “sting,” even “death” is harmless. And slavery under every form, and in all circumstances, is rebellion against Heaven.

5. *Our relations to the oppressor on the one hand, and to the oppressed on the other, lay us under sacred obligations to reprove the one and plead for the other.* Can we, while we “suffer sin upon him,” “love our neighbor as we love ourselves?” Especially, when he is exposed, by night and by day, at home and abroad, to those “evil communications which corrupt good manners!” Especially, when from the dawn of his existence he has been constantly exposed to the biases of selfishness and the impulses of passion! Especially, when soothed and encouraged by foes in the guise of friends, he is hastening with rapid step down the “broad road to destruction!” Placed at an elevation, where we cannot but see the direction of his “slippery” path—where the gulph, which awaits his fall, yawns frightfully upon us, how can we refuse to pour upon his ears the loud note of warning? Shall we be discouraged by his stupidity, or deterred by his wrath? Our regard for his highest interests forbid. Truth, fidelity, benevolence, forbid. All things good, true, and holy on earth and in heaven;—the authority of God and the welfare of man, forbid. Let those, who dare, from a short-sighted regard to their own ease, or reputation, or interest, consult his humor, gratify his spleen, cater for his lusts; it is ours, “by all means to rebuke him,” if, peradventure the long-suffering and gracious God will enable us to pluck him from ruin, as a brand is snatched from the burning.

To refuse to plead for the oppressed is most wickedly to forget, that in him we behold a MAN, and have a BROTHER. The moment we, according to the golden rule, change places with him; taking his burdens on our shoulders, and his fetters on our heels, that moment our lips will be opened in vindication of his rights. O with what imploring importunity do not millions of dumb sufferers—our own mother’s children—summon us to their assistance! Grosser selfishness we cannot

be guilty of, than to resist such appeals out of complaisance to their oppressor, or from such patriotism, pitiful and meagre, as would purchase for our country present ease at the expense of future agony, or from such pity as in full view of crushed humanity, bleeding by the way, would pass by on the other side!

These are the principles which lie at the very basis of the anti-slavery enterprise. In the light of these, the friends of freedom feel impelled at every step in their arduous course to proceed. But at every step we are called to encounter suspicion, reproach, opposition; and from those, too, whose holy profession and sacred obligations should place them by our side, as hearty, active, faithful coadjutors.

Have our opponents, then, a set of principles *contrary to ours*, which impel them to meet us in a posture of resistance? What; *do they believe that things are to be regarded as they are not—to be treated contrary to their nature—that men may be reduced to articles of merchandise? Or, that if it be wicked to establish among men the relation of owner and property, that continuance in sin may involve neither guilt nor danger? that repentance may be so immediate and thorough as to be inexpedient and hurtful? that in perfect consistency with our relations to the oppressor and oppressed, we may suffer sin upon the one without rebuke, and misery upon the other without sympathy or succor? Can human nature be reduced to such a plight, as, when presented in their proper shape, to admit such monstrous doctrines?*

But, instead of defending principles like these when stated with definiteness and precision, our opponents very generally acknowledge, that ours, *in themselves considered*, are sound and true—principles to which in the light of reason, they feel constrained to give their assent. What have we here? The principles admitted, in the light of which we clearly and certainly see the objects we are bound to pursue, and the pathway by which alone we can hope to reach and appropriate them;—principles, which have a direct application to the most stupendous and sublime practical designs, and the most powerful bearings upon them;—principles, which, like the living voice of God, are adapted to arouse and develope and enlist all the energies of our nature;—*these principles*, admitted by multitudes in high places, in church and state, who not only refuse to make any correspondent efforts, but decry, and malign, and persecute those around them who dare to “show their faith by their works!” Hence the strife, which is agitating churches and shaking the republic from centre to circumference. Our opponents insist upon it, that we shall make as little of our principles as

they make of theirs—allowing them to float as glittering abstractions on the brain, but carefully excluding their influence from the heart! To this we cannot consent. Hence the quarrel.

In what sort of strife, then, are we called to mingle? Clearly A STRIFE BETWEEN PRINCIPLE ON THE ONE HAND, and NO PRINCIPLE ON THE OTHER. Our adversaries reproach and oppose us, merely because we act on those principles, which even they admit to be sound and trustworthy! We cannot unite with them, unless we will consent to be UNPRINCIPLED! For who can be more unprincipled than he, who permits fundamental truths in morals and religion to lie dormant in the brain.

But the relation, we are told, between abstract principles and human obligation, in the practical concerns of life, is at best remote, if not extremely doubtful. We may wield metaphysics ingeniously; but we cannot expect that sober thinkers, who have never been schooled in Utopia, will be led away by the hair we have so accurately divided. Such miserable cant is worthy of the shallow sophistry, which it is employed to clothe and present. The principles of reason little to do with human obligation! Their relation to the various forms of human life remote and uncertain! No man, who had not “fallen out” with reason, could, for a moment, harbor such a prejudice. What do our opponents mean? It is true, that we never see abstract principles embodied in full perfection, in the conduct of mankind. What then? Are we not furnished in these principles with the model on which we are most diligently and earnestly to form our character? And does not the measure of our excellence depend wholly on the degree of our success? If we refuse to make these principles the standard of our conduct, where shall we find “a guide to lead us along the rugged path to the summit of mount ‘Difficulty?’” The moment your matter-of-fact man, as he is falsely called, rejects these principles in the practical concerns of life, he cuts loose from the throne of Heaven! He has nothing to hold him back from the depths of depravity and the bottom of perdition!

What have we, we demand, in the character of Jesus Christ? The perfection of reason. In Him, all those principles which we perceive by the light within; to which our very nature commands our assent, were embodied and developed in full maturity. In Him they shone forth in the perfection of the most exquisite and subduing beauty. **AND HE IS OUR EXEMPLAR.** If we have any virtue, it must consist in a resemblance to our Saviour. Will this doctrine be denied? Surely

not. The relation, then, between abstract principle and human obligation is most intimate and practical. The one is the standard to which the other is most solicitously to be adjusted.

But are we, the demand is urged upon us;—are we, in acting on principle to bid adieu to *common sense*? What in any such connexion may be meant by “common sense,” we are sure, we cannot conjecture. We are acquainted with a clergyman, who not long ago assured the people of his charge, that as a public teacher, he had done with the subject of slavery! We ventured, in a private interview, to inquire of him, how a preacher could, in an American pulpit, dispose of such passages as continually met his eye on the sacred pages, without opening his lips for the victims of oppression? Our meaning we illustrated by repeating such declarations and injunctions as the following: “whoso stoppeth his ears to the cry of the poor, shall cry himself and shall not be heard. Rid the poor and needy out of the hands of the wicked. Thou shalt not suffer sin upon thy brother; thou shalt in *any wise* rebuke him.” This inquiry he disposed of with the oracular reply, that *the Bible is a common sense book*! He might as well have solved the problem which had been urged on his attention, by quoting “*Adam, Seth, Enos*,” from the Chronicles?

In the light of their own *conduct*, we might perhaps guess at the meaning of such prophets. We should guess, that by “common sense,” they meant that vulgar *cunning*, which may enable one so to turn and twist, so to lengthen and abridge his principles, as artfully to dodge the shafts of persecution. To refuse, when brought to some trying crisis, to purchase the favor of selfish men by silence or compromise, they regard as evincing the want of “*common sense*!” Such common sense can be had, let it be remembered, only at the expense of *common honesty*. Miserable trash! cheap and worthless as dunghill weeds! Selfishness is the soil on which it springs up spontaneously. There, a rank harvest may be gathered. The “hireling,” exposed by our Saviour, who “saw the wolf coming,” was remarkable for “common sense,” such as it was! If he could not maintain the cause of the sheep, without encountering such a *chivalrous* adventurer, whose business it was, like many of his two-legged brethren in modern times, “to steal, and kill, and destroy,” why he would show his *wisdom*, by fleeing away in silence. From such “common sense,” good Lord deliver us!

“But the difficulties, the difficulties, the difficulties!” “We would unite with you, abolitionists, in acting upon your principles, if we were

not deterred by the difficulties. Southern laws! Southern threatenings! Southern violence!" Yes, Rev. Dr. Fearful; and you might add, *Northern* laws! *Northern* threatenings! *Northern* violence! For the main pillars which prop up the old Bastile have their foundation at the North! But in what chapter of your Bible are you taught, that honest men may be deterred by any difficulties, however numerous and formidable, from "acting out" their principles? In this connexion, "They who live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution?" or in that, "Blessed are they which are persecuted for *righteousness*' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven?" Or did you infer such a doctrine from the history of those "despised" ones who were subject to "hunger and thirst;" who were, "naked and buffeted;" having "no certain dwelling place;" who were "made as the *filth of the world and the off-scouring of all things*?" If no difficulties were to be encountered in our way to the kingdom of heaven, what need of "agonizing?" and how could we fill up the measure of His sufferings, who was murdered by the world we are exhorted to court and caress? In behalf of the glorious army of martyrs, you may hear the persecuted Bunyan shout from his prison walls, "*No cross, no crown!*" But are there on the other side no difficulties to be encountered? Find you no difficulties in leaving your suppliant brother in the hands of his oppressor? No difficulties in witnessing the insults and injuries to which he is continually subjected? No difficulties in seeing the rapid strides of slavery towards the North? No difficulties in the prospect of a servile war, which must convulse and rend this guilty nation? No difficulties in the deep disgrace, the intolerable infamy, which is fast settling on our public character? No difficulties in your own case, in the loss of a good conscience? None in the frowns of the orphan's Protector? *We have sinned.* As a nation, we are stoutly guilty of crimes in the matter of slaveholding, whose enormity is only equalled by the depths of meanness to which we have descended. And can we escape from the embarrassments in which we have involved ourselves, without encountering difficulties? Headlong have we plunged into the "miry clay;" and do we expect to reach a sound position, without exhausting efforts? With such expectations we may refuse to exert ourselves, and sink into the depths of the abyss.

We are sometimes charged with cherishing a stiff, unyielding spirit. And our way, it is alleged, we *will have*, without accommodating ourselves at all to the opinions, wishes, and movements, of those who differ from us, however great and good they may generally be esteemed;

whereas, many who condemn our measures, are ready, for the sake of peace, *provided we will do the same*, to keep silence on the exciting subject of oppression. As we cannot agree in adjusting his claims, they are willing to leave the slave where we found him—in the hands of thieves and murderers. Hence, their reputation for comity and kindness and peacemaking! But what sort of a basis have they for this reputation in such overtures? What have we here? On the one side, the apologists of slavery consenting, without further effort, to leave “the poor and needy” in the hands “of the wicked,” provided only that we also will “stop our ears” to their entreaties! Wonderful forbearance! what self-denial for the sake of peace! On the other hand, the hearty friends and pledged advocates of the oppressed, promptly and sternly refusing to violate their principles, and sacrifice their consciences, and sell their brethren, to purchase the deceitful smiles of the hollow-hearted! How quarrelsome! What firebrands! Well; there are terms on which we will cease to urge those arguments and employ those efforts, which now excite and disturb our peace-loving neighbors.—Just bless our eyes with the fragments of “every yoke” which now galls the neck of the oppressed—just let us see every man admitted to the full enjoyment of all his “inalienable rights,” “honored” AS A MAN, according to the value of his nature and the worth of his character—and the quarrel between us and our opponents is over at once and for ever. We love peace as dearly, we prize peace as highly, as our neighbors. But, then, it must be peace supported by principle, and approved by conscience;—spreading its balmy wing over the whole of human nature. Our Bibles teach us that wickedness is malignantly and powerfully anti-social, in all its influences and tendencies.

We must be as stupid, not to understand the conditions on which reconciliation is offered by our adversaries, as we should be wicked, if we could accept of them. They will cease to decry and reproach and resist us, when we will cease to honor the most sacred principles by correspondent action. Till then, never. Till, in other words, we will consent to become UNPRINCIPLED, they are resolved that we shall sustain the shock of that war which they are waging to promote the cause of charity and forbearance and fraternal unity. We may as well count the cost at which we may purchase peace of our civil and ecclesiastical persecutors. In *their* view, the consideration is but trifling; what they have thrown away among worthless rubbish. With us, it is as dear as the smiles of God and the hope of heaven. It is

THE SACRIFICE OF PRINCIPLE. Say, friend of man, can you pay the price? Welcome, then, whatever may befall you in pleading the cause of your stolen brother.

Let us lift up our eyes to heaven. Let us seek refreshment in the shadow of the eternal throne. Ours is the God who has pledged all the resources of his government and all the treasures of the universe to sustain, in full expression and resistless force, the principles he has impressed upon our hearts and imprinted in his word. While we adhere to these principles, he will cheer us with his smiles and support us with his arm. The issue of our controversy with those who have conspired to rob the poor and helpless, cannot be doubtful. Truth must prevail. Righteousness must triumph. The poor shall be raised from the "dunghill" to the side of princes. Happy, thrice happy they, who shall be counted worthy to share the triumphs of that glorious hour.

SLAVERY WARRING AGAINST PRINCIPLE.—Last year a public meeting, held at Clinton, state of Mississippi, to consider the subject of abolitionism, passed the following resolution.

"Resolved, That it is our decided opinion, that any individual who dares to circulate, with a view to effectuate the designs of the abolitionists, any of the incendiary tracts or newspapers now in a course of transmission to this country, is justly worthy in the sight of God and man, of IMMEDIATE DEATH; and we doubt not *that such would be the punishment* of any such offender in any part of the state of Mississippi, where he may be found!"

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA.

"At present, the number of students is TWENTY, of whom THIRTEEN are natives of South Carolina and Georgia, FIVE natives of the northern states, ONE of the western states, and ONE of Canada.

"Of the SEVEN last mentioned, only ONE came to this Institution from the North. But *he was not sent here by Abolitionists*; for he is not only opposed to them in principle and favorable to southern institutions, but he is preparing to leave all he holds dear in this land, that he may spend his days on heathen shores. With regard to the rest, they came to us from the bosoms of southern families, from southern academies and colleges, from communities violently opposed to the schemes of abolitionists, and they came recommended either by southern *Presbyteries* or southern men. They have never been charged with entertaining sentiments favorable to abolition, and inimical to the South. They now authorize us 'TO CONTRADICT ALL THE STATEMENTS which have been made against them; and further say, that they consider their present residence here, together with their former residence (in most instances for several years) in this and other parts of the South, a sufficient evidence of their friendly regard to southern institutions.'"—*Southern Christian Herald*.

